

COMPUTING THE MERTENS AND MEISSEL-MERTENS CONSTANTS FOR SUMS OVER ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS

ALESSANDRO LANGUASCO AND ALESSANDRO ZACCAGNINI

ABSTRACT. We give explicit numerical values with 100 decimal digits for the Mertens constant involved in the asymptotic formula for $\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} 1/p$ and, as a by-product, for the Meissel-Mertens constant defined as $\sum_{p \equiv a \pmod q} (\log(1 - 1/p) + 1/p)$, for $q \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$ and $(q, a) = 1$.
AMS Classification: 11-04, 11Y60

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we use the technique developed in [7] to compute the constants $M(q, a)$ involved in the following asymptotic formula

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} \frac{1}{p} = \frac{\log \log x}{\varphi(q)} + M(q, a) + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right), \quad (1)$$

where $x \rightarrow +\infty$, and the so-called Meissel-Mertens constant

$$B(q, a) := \sum_{p \equiv a \pmod q} \left(\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{p} \right),$$

where, here and throughout the present paper, $q \geq 3$ and a are fixed integers with $(q, a) = 1$, p denotes a prime number, and $\varphi(q)$ is the usual Euler totient function. In fact we will see how to compute $M(q, a)$ with a precision of 100 decimal digits and we will use the results in [7] to obtain the values for $B(q, a)$.

To do so we recall that the constant $C(q, a)$ studied in [6, 7] is defined implicitly by

$$P(x; q, a) := \prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{C(q, a)}{(\log x)^{1/\varphi(q)}} (1 + o(1)) \quad (2)$$

as $x \rightarrow +\infty$. In [6] we proved that

$$C(q, a)^{\varphi(q)} = e^{-\gamma} \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\alpha(p; q, a)}$$

where $\alpha(p; q, a) = \varphi(q) - 1$ if $p \equiv a \pmod q$ and $\alpha(p; q, a) = -1$ otherwise, and γ is the Euler constant. This enabled us to compute their values with 100 decimal digits in [7].

Taking the logarithm of both sides in (2) we get that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} \log\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = \log C(q, a) - \frac{\log \log x}{\varphi(q)} + o(1)$$

as $x \rightarrow +\infty$, and hence, adding (1), we obtain

$$M(q, a) = B(q, a) - \log C(q, a). \quad (3)$$

By (3) and using the results in [7] together with the computation on $M(q, a)$ we will explain, we can compute the corresponding values for $B(q, a)$ in the same range (and with the same precision) for any $q \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$ and $(q, a) = 1$.

We recall that Finch [3] has computed $M(q, a)$ and $C(q, a)$ in the case $q \in \{3, 4\}$ and $(q, a) = 1$.

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Robert Baillie [1] who has driven our attention to the problem of computing $M(q, a)$.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

From now on we will let χ be a Dirichlet character mod q . By the orthogonality of Dirichlet characters, a direct computation and Theorem 428 of Hardy-Wright [5] show that

$$\varphi(q)M(q, a) = \gamma + B - \sum_{p|q} \frac{1}{p} + \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_p \frac{\chi(p)}{p} \quad (4)$$

where

$$B := \sum_p \left(\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{p} \right) \quad (5)$$

is the Meissel-Mertens constant. Moreover, using the Taylor expansion of $\log(1 - x)$ and again by orthogonality, it is clear that

$$\varphi(q)B(q, a) = - \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{1}{m} \sum_p \frac{\chi(p)}{p^m} = - \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{1}{m} \sum_p \frac{\chi(p)}{p^m} + B(q), \quad (6)$$

where $B(q)$, defined as

$$B(q) := - \sum_{m \geq 2} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{(p, q)=1} \frac{1}{p^m},$$

represents the contribution of the principal character $\chi_0 \bmod q$ and it is equal to

$$B(q) = \sum_{(p, q)=1} \left(\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{p} \right) = B - \sum_{p|q} \left(\log\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{p} \right),$$

where B is defined in (5). Recalling from section 2 of [7] that

$$\varphi(q) \log C(q, a) = -\gamma + \log \frac{q}{\varphi(q)} - \sum_{\substack{\chi \bmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m} \sum_p \frac{\chi(p)}{p^m} \quad (7)$$

and comparing the right hand sides of (4), (6) and (7), it is clear that it is much easier to compute $M(q, a)$ than both $C(q, a)$ and $B(q, a)$ since in (4) no prime powers are involved. Moreover, by (3), we can obtain $B(q, a)$ using $M(q, a)$ and $C(q, a)$.

Since in [7] we already computed several values of $C(q, a)$, it is now sufficient to compute $M(q, a)$ for the corresponding pairs q, a .

To accelerate the convergence of the inner sums in (4), (6) and (7), we will consider, as we did in [7], the ‘‘tail’’ of a suitable Euler product. Letting A be a fixed positive integer, we denote the tail of the Euler product of a Dirichlet L -function as

$$L_{Aq}(\chi, s) = \prod_{\substack{p > Aq \\ 2}} \left(1 - \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s} \right)^{-1},$$

where $\chi \neq \chi_0 \pmod q$ and $\Re(s) \geq 1$. Now we prove that

$$\sum_{p > Aq} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^m} = \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, km)), \quad (8)$$

for every integer $m \geq 1$. We use the Möbius inversion with a little care, since the series for $L_{Aq}(\chi, 1)$ is not absolutely convergent. The Taylor expansion for $\log(1-x)$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, km)) &= \sum_{p > Aq} \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{nk p^{nkm}} \chi^{nk}(p) = \sum_{p > Aq} \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \frac{\chi^\ell(p)}{\ell p^{\ell m}} \sum_{\substack{k \geq 2 \\ k|\ell}} \mu(k) \\ &= - \sum_{p > Aq} \sum_{\ell \geq 2} \frac{\chi^\ell(p)}{\ell p^{\ell m}} = \sum_{p > Aq} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^m} - \log L_{Aq}(\chi, m) \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{k|\ell} \mu(k) = 0$ for $\ell \geq 2$, and this proves (8) for every $m \geq 1$.

Inserting now (8), with $m = 1$, in (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(q)M(q, a) &= \gamma + B - \sum_{p|q} \frac{1}{p} + \sum_{\substack{\chi \pmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{p \leq Aq} \frac{\chi(p)}{p} + \sum_{\substack{\chi \pmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, k)) \\ &= \varphi(q) \sum_{\substack{p \leq Aq \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} \frac{1}{p} + M(q) + \sum_{\substack{\chi \pmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, k)), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$M(q) := \gamma + B - \sum_{p|q} \frac{1}{p} - \sum_{\substack{p \leq Aq \\ (p,q)=1}} \frac{1}{p}.$$

For $A \geq 1$, it is clear that the two sums at the right hand side of the previous equation collapse to $\sum_{p \leq Aq} 1/p$ but in (10) we will explicitly need the value of the summation over $p | q$ and hence, to avoid double computations, we will use the definition of $M(q)$ as previously stated.

For $C(q, a)$ the analogue of (9) is eq. (5) of [7] while for $B(q, a)$ it can be obtained arguing in a similar way.

Notice that the Riemann zeta function is never computed at $s = 1$ in (9), since for $k = 1$ we have $\chi^k = \chi = \chi_0$. To compute the summation over χ in (9) we follow the line of section 2 of [7].

This means that to evaluate (9) using a computer program we have to truncate the sum over k and to estimate the error we are introducing. Let $K > 1$ be an integer. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(q)M(q, a) &= \varphi(q) \sum_{\substack{p \leq Aq \\ p \equiv a \pmod q}} \frac{1}{p} + M(q) + \sum_{\substack{\chi \pmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, k)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\chi \pmod q \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{k > K} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log(L_{Aq}(\chi^k, k)) \\ &= \tilde{M}(q, a, A, K) + E_1(q, a, A, K), \end{aligned}$$

say. We remark that B , defined as in (5), can be easily computed up to 1000 correct digits in few seconds by adapting (6) to the case in which the sum in the left hand side runs over the complete set of primes. We recall that Moree [8], see also the appendix by Niklasch, computed

B and many other number theoretic constants with a nice precision, see also Gourdon-Sebah's [4] website. Using the Lemma in [7] and the trivial bound for χ , it is easy to see that

$$|E_1(q, a, A, K)| \leq \frac{2(Aq)^{1-K}(\varphi(q) - 1)}{K^2(Aq - 1)}.$$

We take this occasion to correct a typo in [7] in which, in the inequality for $E_1(q, a, A, K)$ at page 319 there, the factor $2K$ at the denominator should be read as K^2 .

In order to ensure that $\tilde{M}(q, a, A, K)$ is a good approximation of $M(q, a)$ it is sufficient that Aq and K are sufficiently large. Setting $Aq = 9600$ and $K = 26$ yields the desired 100 correct decimal digits.

Now we have to consider the error we are introducing during the evaluation of the Dirichlet L -functions that appear in $\tilde{M}(q, a, A, K)$. This can be done exactly as in section 3 of [7] replacing km there by k . Let T be an even integer and N be a multiple of q . For $\chi \neq \chi_0 \pmod{q}$ and $k \geq 1$, we use the Euler-MacLaurin formula in the following form

$$L_{T,N}(\chi^k, k) = \sum_{r < N} \frac{\chi^k(r)}{r^k} - \frac{1}{N^k} \sum_{j=1}^T \frac{(-1)^{j-1} B_j(\chi^k)}{j!} \frac{k(k+1) \cdots (k+j-2)}{N^{j-1}},$$

where $B_n(\chi)$ denotes the χ -Bernoulli number which is defined by means of the n -th Bernoulli polynomial $B_n(x)$ (see Cohen [2], Definition 9.1.1), as follows

$$B_n(\chi) = f^{n-1} \sum_{a=0}^{f-1} \chi(a) B_n\left(\frac{a}{f}\right)$$

in which f is the conductor of χ .

Hence the error term in evaluating the tail of the Dirichlet L -functions $L_{Aq}(\chi^k, k)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} |E_2(q, a, K, N, T)| &\leq \frac{(\varphi(q) - 1)q^T B_T}{U(q, K, N, T)} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \frac{1}{k} \frac{k \cdots (k+T-2)}{T!} N^{1-k-T} \\ &= \frac{(\varphi(q) - 1)q^T B_T}{U(q, K, N, T)T!} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} (k+1) \cdots (k+T-2) N^{1-k-T} \\ &\leq \frac{(\varphi(q) - 1)(K+T-2)^{T-2} q^T B_T}{U(q, K, N, T)N^{T-1}T!} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} N^{-k} \\ &\leq \frac{2(\varphi(q) - 1)(K+T-2)^{T-2} q^T B_T}{(N-1)U(q, K, N, T)N^{T-1}T!}, \end{aligned}$$

where B_T is the T -th Bernoulli number and

$$U(q, K, N, T) := \min_{\substack{\chi \pmod{q} \\ \chi \neq \chi_0}} \min_{1 \leq k \leq K} |L_{T,N}(\chi^k, k)|.$$

Collecting the previous estimates, we have that

$$\left| M(q, a) - \frac{\tilde{M}(q, a, A, K)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \leq \frac{|E(q, a, A, K, N, T)|}{\varphi(q)}$$

where $E(q, a, A, K, N, T)$ denotes $E_1(q, a, A, K) + E_2(q, a, K, N, T)$.

Practical experimentations for $q \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$ suggested us to use different ranges for N and T to reach a precision of at least 100 decimal digits in a reasonable amount of time. Using $Aq = 9600$, $K = 26$ and recalling that $q \mid N$ and T is even, our choice is $N = (\lfloor 8400/q \rfloor + 1)q$ and $T = 58$ if $q \in \{3, \dots, 10\}$, while for $q \in \{90, \dots, 100\}$ we have to use $N = (\lfloor 27720/q \rfloor + 1)q$ and $T = 88$. Intermediate ranges are used for the remaining integers q .

The programs we used to compute the Dirichlet characters mod q and the values of $M(q, a)$ for $q \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$, $1 \leq a \leq q$, $(q, a) = 1$, were written using the GP scripting language of PARI/GP [9]; the C program was obtained from the GP one using the gp2c tool. The actual computations were performed using a double quad-core Linux pc for a total amount of computing time of about 4 hours and 4 minutes.

A tiny part of the final results is collected in the tables 1-6 listed at the bottom of this paper. The complete set of results can be downloaded from <http://www.math.unipd.it/~languasc/Mertens-co> together with the source program in GP and the results of the verifications of the identities (10) and (11) which are described in the section below.

Moreover, at the same web address, you will also find the values of $B(q, a)$ computed via (3) using the previous results on $M(q, a)$ and the ones for $C(q, a)$ in [7]. The use of (3) implies some sort of “error propagation”. To avoid this phenomenon we recomputed some values of $C(q, a)$. A complete report of this recomputation step can be found at the web address previously mentioned.

Moreover, to be safer, we also directly computed $B(q, a)$ using (6) for $q \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$, $1 \leq a \leq q$ and $(q, a) = 1$. The needed computation time was about 3 days, 6 hours and a quarter. By comparing the values of $B(q, a)$ obtained using these two different methods, we can say that the values of $B(q, a)$ we computed are correct up to 100 decimal digits.

Finally, we also wrote a program to compute $B(q, a)$, $C(q, a)$ and $M(q, a)$ with at least 20 correct decimal digits. Comparing with [7], the main parameters can be chosen now in a much smaller way and so we were able to compute all these constants for every $3 \leq q \leq 300$, $1 \leq a \leq q$, $(q, a) = 1$. In particular, the needed time on a double quad-core Linux pc for the range $q \in \{3, \dots, 200\}$ was about 5 hours and 5 minutes while, for the range $q \in \{201, \dots, 300\}$, it was about 18 hours. In this case we directly computed $B(q, a)$, $C(q, a)$ and $M(q, a)$ and we used (3) as a consistency check.

The whole set of these results can be downloaded at the web address previously mentioned.

3. VERIFICATION OF CONSISTENCY

The set of constants $M(q, a)$ satisfies many identities, and we checked our results verifying that these identities hold within a very small error. The basic identities that we exploited are two: the first one is

$$\sum_{\substack{a \bmod q \\ (q, a) = 1}} M(q, a) = \gamma + B - \sum_{p|q} \frac{1}{p}. \quad (10)$$

This can be verified by a direct computation, taking into account the fact that primes dividing q do not occur in any sum of the type $\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \bmod q}} \frac{1}{p}$.

The other identity is valid whenever we take two moduli q_1 and q_2 with $q_1 | q_2$ and $(a, q_1) = 1$. In this case we have

$$M(q_1, a) = \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ (a+jq_1, q_2)=1}}^{n-1} M(q_2, a + jq_1) + \sum_{\substack{p|q_2 \\ p \equiv a \bmod q_1}} \frac{1}{p} \quad (11)$$

where $n = q_2/q_1$.

Equation (11) holds also for $B(q, a)$ with the only remark that in the final summation the summand $1/p$ should be replaced by $\log(1 - 1/p) + 1/p$. Concerning (10), this holds for $B(q, a)$ too if we replace $\gamma - \sum_{p|q} 1/p$ with $-\sum_{p|q} (\log(1 - 1/p) + 1/p)$.

The proof of (11) depends on the fact that the residue class $a \bmod q_1$ is the union of the classes $a + jq_1 \bmod q_2$, for $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. If q_1 and q_2 have the same set of prime factors

the condition $(a + jq_1, q_2) = 1$ is automatically satisfied, since $(a, q_1) = 1$ by our hypothesis. On the other hand, if q_2 has a prime factor p that q_1 lacks, then there are values of j such that $p \mid (a + jq_1, q_2)$ and the corresponding value of $M(q_2, a + jq_1)$ in the right hand side of (11) would be undefined. The sum at the far right takes into account these primes.

The validity of (10) was checked immediately at the end of the computation of the constants $M(q, a)$, for a fixed q and for every $1 \leq a \leq q$ with $(q, a) = 1$ by the same program that computed them. These results were collected in a file and a different program checked that (11) holds within a very small error by building every possible relation of that kind for every $q_2 \in \{3, \dots, 100\}$ and $q_1 \mid q_2$ with $1 < q_1 < q_2$. As in [7], the total number of identities checked is

$$\sum_{q=3}^{100} \sum_{\substack{d \mid q \\ 1 < d < q}} \varphi(d) = \sum_{q=3}^{100} (q - 1 - \varphi(q)) = 1907$$

but they are not independent on one another. We did not bother to eliminate redundancies since the total time requested for this part of the computation is absolutely negligible. Again as in [7], the number of independent identities is

$$\sum_{q=3}^{100} \sum_{\substack{p \mid q \\ p < q}} \varphi\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) = \sum_{n=2}^{100} \pi\left(\frac{100}{n}\right) \varphi(n) = 1383,$$

where p denotes a prime in the sum on the left. Please remark that in [7], page 323, we erroneously wrote that the previous sum is equal to 1408 which is in fact its value starting from $n = 1$.

Similar checks were done also for the 20 digits case. Working for every $q \leq 300$ we have 12343 independent relations over a total number of 17453 ones. In this case, too, we obtained the desired precision (at least 20 decimal digits).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Baillie. E-mail communication. 2009.
- [2] H. Cohen. *Number Theory. Volume II: Analytic and Modern Tools*, volume 240 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2007.
- [3] S. R. Finch. Mertens' formula. Preprint. <http://algo.inria.fr/csolve/mrtns.pdf>, 2007.
- [4] X. Gourdon and P. Sebah. Some constants from number theory. *webpage available from* <http://numbers.computation.free.fr/Constants/Miscellaneous/constantsNumTheory.html>, 2001.
- [5] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*. Oxford Science Publications, Oxford, fifth edition, 1979.
- [6] A. Languasco and A. Zaccagnini. A note on Mertens' formula for arithmetic progressions. *Journal of Number Theory*, 127:37–46, 2007.
- [7] A. Languasco and A. Zaccagnini. On the constant in the Mertens product for arithmetic progressions. II. Numerical values. *Math. Comp.*, 78:315–326, 2009.
- [8] P. Moree. Approximation of singular series and automata. *Manuscripta Math.*, 101:385–399, 2000. With an appendix by G. Niklasch.
- [9] The PARI Group, Bordeaux. *PARI/GP, version 2.3.1 - 2.3.2*, 2005. Available from <http://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/>.

Alessandro Languasco, Dipartimento di Matematica Pura e Applicata, Università di Padova, Via Trieste 63, 35121 Padova, Italy; languasco@math.unipd.it

Alessandro Zaccagnini, Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Parma, Parco Area delle Scienze 53/a, Campus Universitario, 43100 Parma, Italy; alessandro.zaccagnini@unipr.it

q	a	$M(q, a)$	digits
3	1	-0.3568904795094431291196495672231858954785 ...	104
3	2	0.2850543590237525795417430724985484211968 ...	104
4	1	-0.2867420562261751986539451414394238573642 ...	104
4	3	0.0482392690738179824093719800481197164157 ...	104
5	1	-0.2088344499872589831393679436740355309848 ...	104
5	2	0.3960964763519752181620428282992694487673 ...	104
5	3	0.1386504040417767598465036287614177642579 ...	104
5	4	-0.2644152175588502111137516747779558229888 ...	104
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
9	1	-0.1623582321428699054929449337179721787641 ...	104
9	2	0.4073663127461732280783211701614365152217 ...	104
9	4	-0.1293374149143960665485300101130823600639 ...	104
9	5	0.0358267016686470538569841873571831423790 ...	104
9	7	-0.0651948324521771570781746233921313566504 ...	104
9	8	-0.1581386553910677023935622850200712364040 ...	104
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
15	1	-0.1506479789635675321223227319951881293922 ...	104
15	2	0.3967702079831602519989220502990044120830 ...	104
15	4	-0.1298987796705018718274645424839556504587 ...	104
15	7	-0.0006737316311850338368792219997349633156 ...	104
15	8	-0.1190129400473678821538466338276084167633 ...	104
15	11	-0.0581864710236914510170452116788474015926 ...	104
15	13	-0.0756699892441886913329830707443071523119 ...	104
15	14	-0.1345164378883483392862871322940001725301 ...	104
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
21	1	-0.1084483613299595805404935908928381422038 ...	104
21	2	0.4250487959922326653260015663325925353478 ...	104
21	4	-0.1122733018685413863141062477981428831803 ...	104
21	5	0.1038169332452743207625287126777970125078 ...	104
21	8	-0.0786267812146117135562454190553963721560 ...	104
21	10	-0.0827607926062097370238031413241567050640 ...	104
21	11	-0.0174063652116240128169859448210067632915 ...	104
21	13	-0.0396915037660255136713627233956554116480 ...	104
21	16	-0.0990310666212991177281328116294234061275 ...	104
21	17	-0.0495316505530113215988979410810678190789 ...	104
21	19	-0.0575425961745506509846081950401122043977 ...	104
21	20	-0.0982465732345073585746579015543701721321 ...	104

TABLE 1. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $M(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.

q	a	$M(q, a)$	digits
39	1	-0.0544150300747313383827161426970038945340...	104
39	2	0.4598676271292146454635405190244096879502...	104
39	4	-0.0459945989750685459192257387089186431466...	104
39	5	0.1419809783012313146832767050494466413940...	104
39	7	0.0795104580446772217182944213478570283508...	104
39	8	-0.0482711271695363892787808993829901318045...	104
39	10	-0.0625407087664201913542100549743954739736...	104
39	11	0.0351003379054991567928449805604752789995...	104
39	14	-0.0462707514061093124433385415480332066056...	104
39	16	-0.0671621258405927639177835818713861803563...	104
39	17	-0.0045382608754434839604448757618956856127...	104
39	19	-0.0078618584432586956665912002217299778289...	104
39	20	-0.0459231434298270830511730272690723063199...	104
39	22	-0.0510428073342697409080043003007927978280...	104
39	23	-0.0124631690534506350301370113904825945643...	104
39	25	-0.0581243810207459383640563019555017509681...	104
39	28	-0.0517462190695606135794914158573956691966...	104
39	29	-0.0270586216004553688028443336640559574303...	104
39	31	-0.0298803394337857678868833935975175701503...	104
39	32	-0.0473004404088889108385362179544297078717...	104
39	34	-0.0463158869206440559788110651402015355032...	104
39	35	-0.0548045111222561868022129723349733959006...	104
39	37	-0.0382400585981196219570938701692763534202...	104
39	38	-0.0652645592462251671904512528298502010370...	104

TABLE 2. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $M(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.

q	a	$M(q, a)$	digits
84	1	-0.0734639142617973328342764883795225181917...	104
84	5	0.1483235495915302335618054737355898008922...	104
84	11	0.0290724024926249302145251081589204300848...	104
84	13	0.0224290728747548696540000597026220130239...	104
84	17	0.0003006811962294747858026144190460423904...	104
84	19	-0.0057630788020940875837442254844273481232...	104
84	23	-0.0138497965201530520881105236922199356889...	104
84	25	-0.0607016756429021608396776477008214514160...	104
84	29	-0.0222266883543388763218294385273009788572...	104
84	31	-0.0325213918938471846809848382364695447795...	104
84	37	-0.0442703289531425263413021626262327744388...	104
84	41	-0.0475336593998265389573863164643172518681...	104
84	43	-0.0349844470681622477062171025133156240120...	104
84	47	-0.0445066163462559127992767610577927883843...	104
84	53	-0.0464787677042489430315110529799271933763...	104
84	55	-0.0621205766407803833253627830982774246719...	104
84	59	-0.0498323317492407963847005555001138614693...	104
84	61	-0.0517795173724565634008639695556848562744...	104
84	65	-0.0611014074876142825858879099751875289632...	104
84	67	-0.0515716262256392254744286000973214317642...	104
84	71	-0.0564000928602728372344159805280953932988...	104
84	73	-0.0502394007123625523428183030876871602845...	104
84	79	-0.0547607376681565913868306490031906316886...	104
84	83	-0.0507129138346808196172715850900529202640...	104

TABLE 3. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $M(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.

q	a	$B(q, a)$	digits
3	1	-0.0179374320543395898017537423354360793084...	103
3	2	-0.2256492452247194384046517270072546894435...	103
4	1	-0.0303152628374217668471785632748622368557...	103
4	3	-0.0922560086565230005866745667406677670593...	103
5	1	-0.0056989812258217866230186764730771910864...	103
5	2	-0.2072541594806942995597739906452261268831...	103
5	3	-0.0770818781394248684981698458665942749449...	103
5	4	-0.0025398818937393664038276481789744757015...	103
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
9	1	-0.0020696391618847864572238027206860724807...	103
9	2	-0.1986304651091420386235919033135853530442...	103
9	4	-0.0039355992675986157162225504954464900241...	103
9	5	-0.0247398868156813518681399775437689383104...	102
9	7	-0.0119321936248561876283073891193035168035...	102
9	8	-0.0022788932998960479129198461499003980889...	103
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
15	1	-0.0007572379320997903470262134621931512735...	103
15	2	-0.1953264208891238586234409171756188321671...	103
15	4	-0.0016365552581033232050519597636557571823...	103
15	7	-0.0119277385915704409363330734696072947160...	102
15	8	-0.0013342030920277845401475680955985955697...	103
15	11	-0.0049417432937219962759924630108840398129...	102
15	13	-0.0036159002725660353133424956399798761365...	102
15	14	-0.0009033266356360431987756884153187185191...	103
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
21	1	-0.0003412956292374148069148220346920460252...	103
21	2	-0.1942344947334699688894003974560112287700...	103
21	4	-0.0002098816767539160024207752141222498501...	103
21	5	-0.0235093228522841911201270554154748282363...	102
21	8	-0.0007915893971472685099562881470728940934...	102
21	10	-0.0006922252022738492137317334872558725556...	102
21	11	-0.0046535617744727410631965497667779194062...	102
21	13	-0.0032481317635525831931756409952984059420...	102
21	16	-0.0004945238101126788996808520807420758727...	102
21	17	-0.0020363536140986162458739759280171063102...	102
21	19	-0.0016578370022937005358116763179908292912...	102
21	20	-0.0004239228532466525760974602939007126272...	102

TABLE 4. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $B(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.

q	a	$B(q, a)$	digits
39	1	-0.0001121391210993880688819721271925997627...	102
39	2	-0.1934769655975371993490813769210619094240...	102
39	4	-0.0002995815105830464353463369791216808136...	102
39	5	-0.0232346770448918237834268807192861283189...	102
39	7	-0.0113299371144385520676547127480047428604...	102
39	8	-0.0002454341727558259212509705166966869744...	102
39	10	-0.0000459138224155805565513538531922246471...	102
39	11	-0.0044929480570028872659134897718135000937...	102
39	14	-0.0002193611514478558639221844642199225052...	102
39	16	-0.0000223235704255911196145171142624220894...	102
39	17	-0.0018338873065642236614942324023402025533...	102
39	19	-0.0015031092616855056695375513171955283284...	102
39	20	-0.0001858990560853595070479345313080934723...	102
39	22	-0.0001705919794542183214877183738499262132...	102
39	23	-0.0010537105458215435324380971901947683990...	102
39	25	-0.0000730986515003499343341780315856293861...	102
39	28	-0.0001342213885419137800239278870137043470...	102
39	29	-0.0006675737489094563083519829970440655189...	102
39	31	-0.0005852676315151717436339529174197209276...	102
39	32	-0.0001433829254050606314390524017643892945...	102
39	34	-0.0001404190990760282183009755731128149793...	102
39	35	-0.0000707291474709482991989950130887911099...	102
39	37	-0.0004011981531447411395316606101222440231...	102
39	38	-0.0000246764708272542810865300784362317789...	102

TABLE 5. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $B(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.

q	a	$B(q, a)$	digits
84	1	-0.0000119163858637686167954725330316682793...	102
84	5	-0.0232403602184713008048627754438543014690...	102
84	11	-0.0044365093956013183002165422530420512818...	102
84	13	-0.0032012002462998617358456975415447057261...	102
84	17	-0.0018681454567877949532487758242611745268...	102
84	19	-0.0014999868517105941255280000567662988513...	102
84	23	-0.0010419325887589517242899271111822879451...	102
84	25	-0.0000667248398877511948366874331992186367...	102
84	29	-0.0006749316281200272421803236576904643492...	102
84	31	-0.0005598064648252633420494915697566166895...	102
84	37	-0.0003842227265021586749603313599748870266...	102
84	41	-0.0003150584838202808316242249021937896620...	102
84	43	-0.0003293792433736461901193495016603777458...	102
84	47	-0.0002689626338128903152642799716205267673...	102
84	53	-0.0002170523788714227629800075137358681243...	102
84	55	-0.0000469315172527214573299434537537002158...	102
84	59	-0.0001682081573108212926252001037559317834...	102
84	61	-0.0001578501505831064102836762612245304399...	102
84	65	-0.0000453815847657077478783488866523727492...	102
84	67	-0.0001431568368661648075840877809230312134...	102
84	71	-0.0001166577690272412677759644893824297442...	102
84	73	-0.0001324187374485858716822419174992558660...	102
84	79	-0.0001103010836105202247205207207671888461...	102
84	83	-0.0001088643694263717444732353917069229651...	102

TABLE 6. Some numerical results: the first column contains the modulus q , the second the residue class a , the third the computed value of $B(q, a)$ and the fourth is the number of correct decimal digits we obtained. The table shows the values truncated to 40 decimal digits.